

Stephanie Kost

From: LEXBLUEZ32@cs.com
Sent: Friday, September 24, 2004 7:02 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: A La Carte

I OPPOSE A La Carte Cable Regulation.

Stephanie Kost

From: Rodar4u2@aol.com
Sent: Saturday, September 25, 2004 10:06 AM
To: Michael Powell; Kathleen Abernathy; KJMWEB; Jonathan Adelstein
Subject: A La Carte regulation

We oppose A La Carte regulation.
Rodney M. Johnson, Apache Junction AZ 85219
Darlene R. Johnson, Apache Junction AZ. 85219

Stephanie Kost

From: Rodar4u2@aol.com
Sent: Saturday, September 25, 2004 10:06 AM
To: Michael Powell; Kathleen Abernathy; KJMWEB; Jonathan Adelstein
Subject: A La Carte regulation

We oppose A La Carte regulation.

Rodney M. Johnson, Apache Junction AZ 85219

Darlene R. Johnson, Apache Junction AZ. 85219

Stephanie Kost

From: scoker@comptroller.state.al.us
Sent: Tuesday, September 21, 2004 2:53 PM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: FW: A La Carte

This is to inform you that I oppose the A La Carte Cable Regulation and to let you know I have also contacted my Representative about this matter and expect him to support my views.

-----Original Message-----

From: Congress.org [mailto:no-reply@congress.org]
Sent: Tuesday, September 21, 2004 12:42 PM
To: Congress.org
Subject: A La Carte

Thank you for using Congress.org Mail System

Message sent to the following recipients:

Mr. President

Message text follows:

Shirley Coker
4135 Airport Rd.
Millbrook, Al 36054

September 21, 2004

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here],

I oppose A La Carte Cable Regulation. I pray you are against this regulation. It is dissapointing to see how much America is going against what our great country was founded on. God and His Word. Thank you in advance for you help in this matter. I have already E-Mailed my US House Represenative, Terry Everett and will be sending a copy of this to the FFC.

Sincerely,

Shirley Coker
334-285-9915

Stephanie Kost

From: Scott Brazil [scott.brazil@nts-online.net]
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 12:05 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: "I OPPOSE A LA CARTE CABLE REGULATION"

Dear Commissioners,

I have just written my Congressman and made my opposition clear concerning the "A La Carte Cable Regulation" that had been presented to the FCC on July 28th of this year! This proposed regulation is nothing more than an attempt to limit religious programming to the general public. There are plenty of violent cable channels and nudity on the regular cable packages that the general public has to flip through in route to the channels they want to watch but you don't have them/me petitioning you to remove them because I/we accidentally might watch! You simply cannot single out one group while allowing the violence and soft porn channels to remain!

Respectfully,

**Scott Brazil
Mobile Number (806)-777-2258
Home Number (806)- 798-7706
7421 Highway 62 Spc 3
Lubbock, Texas 79407**

Stephanie Kost

From: Scott Brazil [scott.brazil@nts-online.net]
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 12:05 PM
To: Michael Powell; Kathleen Abernathy; Michael Copps; KJMWEB; Jonathan Adelstein
Subject: "I OPPOSE A LA CARTE CABLE REGULATION"

Dear Commissioners,

I have just written my Congressman and made my opposition clear concerning the "A La Carte Cable Regulation" that had been presented to the FCC on July 28th of this year! This proposed regulation is nothing more than an attempt to limit religious programming to the general public. There are plenty of violent cable channels and nudity on the regular cable packages that the general public has to flip through in route to the channels they want to watch but you don't have them/me petitioning you to remove them because I/we accidentally might watch! You simply cannot single out one group while allowing the violence and soft porn channels to remain!

Respectfully,

**Scott Brazil
Mobile Number (806)-777-2258
Home Number (806)- 798-7706
7421 Highway 62 Spc 3
Lubbock, Texas 79407**

Stephanie Kost

From: Scott Brazil [scott.brazil@nts-online.net]
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 12:05 PM
To: Michael Powell; Kathleen Abernathy; Michael Copps; KJMWEB; Jonathan Adelstein
Subject: "I OPPOSE A LA CARTE CABLE REGULATION"

Dear Commissioners,

I have just written my Congressman and made my opposition clear concerning the "A La Carte Cable Regulation" that had been presented to the FCC on July 28th of this year! This proposed regulation is nothing more than an attempt to limit religious programming to the general public. There are plenty of violent cable channels and nudity on the regular cable packages that the general public has to flip through in route to the channels they want to watch but you don't have them/me petitioning you to remove them because I/we accidentally might watch! You simply cannot single out one group while allowing the violence and soft porn channels to remain!

Respectfully,

**Scott Brazil
Mobile Number (806)-777-2258
Home Number (806)- 798-7706
7421 Highway 62 Spc 3
Lubbock, Texas 79407**

Stephanie Kost

From: Scott Brazil [scott.brazil@nts-online.net]
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2004 12:05 PM
To: Michael Powell; Kathleen Abernathy; Michael Copps; KJMWEB; Jonathan Adelstein
Subject: "I OPPOSE A LA CARTE CABLE REGULATION"

Dear Commissioners,

I have just written my Congressman and made my opposition clear concerning the "A La Carte Cable Regulation" that had been presented to the FCC on July 28th of this year! This proposed regulation is nothing more than an attempt to limit religious programming to the general public. There are plenty of violent cable channels and nudity on the regular cable packages that the general public has to flip through in route to the channels they want to watch but you don't have them/me petitioning you to remove them because I/we accidentally might watch! You simply cannot single out one group while allowing the violence and soft porn channels to remain!

Respectfully,

Scott Brazil
Mobile Number (806)-777-2258
Home Number (806)- 798-7706
7421 Highway 62 Spc 3
Lubbock, Texas 79407

Stephanie Kost

From: Scott Cooper [scottcooper@prodigy.net]
Sent: Thursday, September 09, 2004 2:55 PM
To: Michael Copps
Subject: Requiring TV service companies to offer at least one option that is a family-friendly package
Importance: High

Dear Commissioner Copps:

I'm the father of three, past and current member of education and drug boards in Sonoma County, California, and author of a few national parenting books. I've written you before to urge you as strongly as I can to champion regulation that would help protect children from adult TV entertainment.

I once again implore you to initiate regulations that require TV broadcasters (including cable and satellite TV service companies) to provide at least one option or package that is specifically family-friendly ("PG" in content). I have directly lobbied the industry to do this voluntarily for over two years without success or interest on the part of leading industry players.

The onus must be on commercial interests to offer products in ways that are safe and responsible and take into account the protection of minors. While parents can make the choice as to which options to purchase, the options themselves must be available. Right now they are not.

I will continue to send this e-mail on a weekly basis. I would greatly appreciate it if you could let me know what I need to do to create movement on this issue and if there's somebody else I should contact who may already be championing this within government.

Thank you for your efforts and service on behalf of all of us.

Regards,

Scott Cooper
Petaluma, CA
707-765-9571

Stephanie Kost

From: Scott Cooper [scottcooper@prodigy.net]
Sent: Tuesday, September 07, 2004 10:55 AM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: New study

Dear Commissioner Adelstein:

As a father, I plead with you to help counter these influences. Industry is not responding responsibly and needs regulation. Please provide us with "a la carte" or "tiered" options that allow parents who want to, to protect their children.

Scott Cooper
Petaluma, CA
707-765-9571

High Exposure to TV Sex Affects Teens Correlation Found Between Teen Viewing of TV Shows With Sexual Content, Their Sexual Activity

The Associated Press

CHICAGO Sept. 7, 2004 — Children who watched a lot of TV with sexual content were about twice as likely to start having intercourse during the subsequent year as those with little exposure to televised sex, researchers found.

High exposure to TV sex among those age 12 to 17 also was linked with a lower but still substantially increased risk of starting non-intercourse behavior, including passionate kissing and oral sex, the researchers found. Even shows that only refer to sex but don't depict it had the effect, they found.



advertisement_gif.
gif (188 B)



walm-336x280-000
2.jpg (21 KB)

Exposure to TV that included only talk about sex was associated with the same risks as exposure to TV that depicted sexual behavior," said Rand Corp. behavioral scientist Rebecca Collins and colleagues.

From innuendoes to depictions of intercourse, sex is pervasive on TV, present in about two-thirds of all shows other than news and sports, and teens watch an average of three hours of television daily, previous research has shown.

TV thus "may create the illusion that sex is more central to daily life than it truly is and may promote sexual initiation as a result," the researchers said.

"When they're watching it for three hours a day, it really does become their social world. Those characters are people they identify with and pay attention to," said Collins, the lead researcher.

TV sex rarely deals with negative aspects most teens aren't prepared to deal with, including unwanted pregnancy, AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases, she said.

That "sends kids the message that everybody's having sex and nobody's thinking about responsibility and nothing bad ever happens," Collins said. "You don't see the fade to black, the couple has sex, and the next morning says, 'You gave me an STD.'"

The study appears in September's *Pediatrics*, released Tuesday.

The results are based on nationwide telephone surveys of 1,792 adolescents queried in 2001 and again in 2002. Parental consent for participation was obtained before the interviews.

The researchers devised a list of 23 popular shows that on average featured abundant sexual content. Programs the researchers considered high in sexual content included "That '70s Show," "Friends" and "Sex and the City" all popular with teens.

Participants then were asked how often they watched those 23 shows. They also were asked whether they engaged in various sexual activities; results were compared from the two surveys.

The number of teens who reported having had intercourse climbed from about 18 percent to 36 percent. The number who'd had sexual experiences other than intercourse climbed from 62 percent to 75 percent, Collins said.

Factors that increased the likelihood of having intercourse included being older, having older friends and getting poor grades. But even considering those factors, television still remained a strong influence, the researchers said.

Many youngsters start having sex during their teen years, and previous data show that 46 percent of high school students say they've had intercourse. But many say they wish they'd waited longer to have sex, and television might be among factors influencing them to become sexually active too soon, the researchers said.

Liliana Escobar-Chaves, a researcher at the University of Texas School of Public Health, said the findings illustrate the importance of parents viewing and discussing TV with their kids, and of encouraging TV writers to depict sex responsibly.

The latter effort is a focus of The Media Project, a Los Angeles-based advocacy program that works with TV networks to include accurate and responsible sex images in programming.

"We want kids to look at television with an educated eye," said Melissa Havard, the group's director.

One example is an HIV/AIDS effort the group has collaborated on with media giant Viacom, whose properties include CBS and MTV. In the past year and a half, Viacom has produced 22 shows with positive HIV messages, including a "Star Trek" episode in which Vulcans had to deal with the stigma of having an AIDS-like disease, said Viacom spokesman Carl Folta.

But while acknowledging that television "certainly can make an impact," Folta was skeptical of the study results.

"I don't think television makes anybody do anything," Folta said. It's just one of many factors that influence young people's lives, he said.

On the Net:

Pediatrics:

Copyright 2004 The Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

Stephanie Kost

From: Amanda Hyland [ahyland@kc.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2004 5:03 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Amanda Hyland
8416 NW Nodaway Dr
Parkville, mo 64152

October 19, 2004

Kathleen Q Abernathy

Dear Kathleen Abernathy:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Amanda Hyland
816-746-0376

Stephanie Kost

From: Amanda Hyland [ahyland@kc.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2004 5:03 PM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Amanda Hyland
8416 NW Nodaway Dr
Parkville, mo 64152

October 19, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Amanda Hyland
816-746-0376

Stephanie Kost

From: Amanda Hyland [ahyland@kc.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2004 5:03 PM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Amanda Hyland
8416 NW Nodaway Dr
Parkville, mo 64152

October 19, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein
,

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Amanda Hyland
816-746-0376

Stephanie Kost

From: Amanda Hyland [ahyland@kc.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2004 5:03 PM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Amanda Hyland
8416 NW Nodaway Dr
Parkville, mo 64152

October 19, 2004

Michael K Powell

Dear Michael Powell:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Amanda Hyland
816-746-0376

Stephanie Kost

From: Amanda Reeves [creative@winninginlife.org]
Sent: Thursday, October 14, 2004 10:39 AM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Amanda Reeves
956 Olive Rd Apt 2D
Homewood, IL 60430

October 14, 2004

Kathleen Q Abernathy

Dear Kathleen Abernathy:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Amanda Reeves

Stephanie Kost

From: Amanda Reeves [creative@winninginlife.org]
Sent: Thursday, October 14, 2004 10:39 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Amanda Reeves
956 Olive Rd Apt 2D
Homewood, IL 60430

October 14, 2004

Kevin J Martin

Dear Kevin Martin:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Amanda Reeves

Stephanie Kost

From: Amanda Reeves [creative@winninginlife.org]
Sent: Thursday, October 14, 2004 10:39 AM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Amanda Reeves
956 Olive Rd Apt 2D
Homewood, IL 60430

October 14, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Amanda Reeves

Stephanie Kost

From: Amanda Reeves [creative@winninginlife.org]
Sent: Thursday, October 14, 2004 10:39 AM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Amanda Reeves
956 Olive Rd Apt 2D
Homewood, IL 60430

October 14, 2004

Michael K Powell

Dear Michael Powell:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Amanda Reeves

Stephanie Kost

From: Amanda Reeves [creative@winninginlife.org]
Sent: Thursday, October 14, 2004 10:39 AM
To: Michael Copps
Subject: Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Amanda Reeves
956 Olive Rd Apt 2D
Homewood, IL 60430

October 14, 2004

Michael J Copps
,

Dear Michael Copps:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Amanda Reeves

Stephanie Kost

From: Amber Harding [aharding@mounet.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 16, 2004 12:59 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Amber Harding
Rt 4 Box 4484
Jonesville, VA 24263

October 16, 2004

Kathleen Q Abernathy
,

Dear Kathleen Abernathy:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Amber Harding
(275)346-2379

Stephanie Kost

From: Amber Harding [aharding@mounet.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 16, 2004 12:59 PM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Amber Harding
Rt 4 Box 4484
Jonesville, VA 24263

October 16, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Amber Harding
(275)346-2379

Stephanie Kost

From: Amber Harding [aharding@mounet.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 16, 2004 12:59 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Amber Harding
Rt 4 Box 4484
Jonesville, VA 24263

October 16, 2004

Kevin J Martin

Dear Kevin Martin:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Amber Harding
(275)346-2379

Stephanie Kost

From: Amber Harding [aharding@mounet.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 16, 2004 12:59 PM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Amber Harding
Rt 4 Box 4484
Jonesville, VA 24263

October 16, 2004

Michael K Powell

Dear Michael Powell:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Amber Harding
(275)346-2379

Stephanie Kost

From: Amy Fling [fli632@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 16, 2004 6:58 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: No on "A La Carte" Cable

Amy Fling
6428 Merrill Road
Columbia, South Carolina 29209

October 16, 2004

Kathleen Q Abernathy

Dear Kathleen Abernathy:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Amy Fling
(803) 695-7635

Stephanie Kost

From: Amy Fling [fli632@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 16, 2004 6:58 PM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: No on "A La Carte" Cable

Amy Fling
6428 Merrill Road
Columbia, South Carolina 29209

October 16, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein
,

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Amy Fling
(803) 695-7635

Stephanie Kost

From: Amy Fling [fli632@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 16, 2004 6:58 PM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: No on "A La Carte" Cable

Amy Fling
6428 Merrill Road
Columbia, South Carolina 29209

October 16, 2004

Michael K Powell
,

Dear Michael Powell:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Amy Fling
(803) 695-7635

Stephanie Kost

From: Amy Fling [fli632@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, October 16, 2004 6:58 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: No on "A La Carte" Cable

Amy Fling
6428 Merrill Road
Columbia, South Carolina 29209

October 16, 2004

Kevin J Martin

Dear Kevin Martin:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Amy Fling
(803) 695-7635

Stephanie Kost

From: Amy Limbaugh [climbaugh@cox.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 13, 2004 5:51 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Amy Limbaugh
1337 Montcrest Way
Amarillo, Tx. 79124

October 13, 2004

Kathleen Q Abernathy

Dear Kathleen Abernathy:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Amy D. Limbaugh
8063568438